

GISAC Minutes, November 5, 2008

Contributed by Cindy Clark
10, Dec. 2008
Last Updated 16, Dec. 2008

Below are the minutes from the November 5, 2008 GISAC Meeting

GISAC, November 5, 2008, Place: USGS Water Resources

Attendees

Steve Keisel,	Salt Lake County Surveyor
Dave Vincent,	USGS
Ben Clement,	Carbon County
Brock Fausett,	Carbon County
Anne Johnson,	UDAF
Mick Robinson,	Emery County
Kristen Jensen,	State History
Cindy Sessions,	USDA FSA APFO
Kevin Sato,	Cottonwood Heights
Elizabeth Perkes,	State Archives
Eric Edgley,	Utah Water Resources
JeannieWatanabe,	AGRC
Rick Kelson,	AGRC
Chris Glazier,	UDOT
Tom Springsteer,	U of U
PhoebeMcNeally,	U of U
Bert Granberg,	AGRC
Ryan Pierce,	NRCS
Lina Haggard,	SITLA
Buck Ehler,	UGS
Steve Bowman,	UGS
Lance Weaver,	UGS
Chris Giarrard,	USU
Chris McGinty,	USU
Jessica Kirby,	SITLA
Doug Ramsey,	USU
John Lowry,	USU
Neil Hood,	DTS/Tax
Joy Jasperson,	STC
Don J. Wood,	Wasatch County
Cindy Clark,	AGRC

Agenda:

1. Geospatial Data Retention Schedules
2. Archival Preservation of Geospatial Data Business Plan
3. 2009 High Resolution Imagery and NAIP planning
4. Automated Feature Extraction Project report
5. Utah Geospatial Infrastructure Strategic Plan discussion
6. Other Topics

1. Geospatial Data Retention Schedules: Elizabeth Perkes from the Utah State Archives introduced an archiving and preservation project the state is involved in. The AGRC and State Archives are partnered with the Archives and GIS departments of both Kentucky and North Carolina. The project is being funded by the Library of Congress.

Elizabeth explained how the AGRC has been work with Archives to develop general retention schedules for their data. These schedules use the ISO standards to delineate the subject matter for each schedule. The retention schedules will be used to retain geospatial data from the SGID. The details of how the data will be captured and how to maintain it in a usable format for the future are still in planning.

Elizabeth was hoping to appeal to the county GIS representatives and state agency GIS representatives that were at the meeting to consider being a part of the project by letting the AGRC inventory their entity's GIS data, so there is a record of their data, and a beginning for the process of transferring the data to the Archives for preservation.

2. Archival Preservation of Geospatial Data Business Plan: Dennis Goreham reported on the part of the Archive project that he is involved with. He and others in the project are working on a Business Plan that will eventually be used to present to fiscal analysts of the State's executive and legislative branches to request funds to continue this archiving process. Utah has borrowed some wording from Archive's Electronic Records Business Plan. Once the Utah Business Plan has been finished it will probably become the template for other states as they look for legislative funding to begin their geospatial preservation.

3. 2009 High Resolution Imagery and NAIP planning: Cindy Sessions, of the APFO, explained the 2009 NAIP project, the cost, and what area would be flown. NAIP will now be flown in a 3 year cycle rather than a 5 year cycle. There could be a larger area flown, but there would need to be partners to do that. For the color infrared coverage for the whole state the additional cost would be \$200,000.

High Resolution: One ft. imagery will be flown along the Wasatch Front, from Brigham City to Spanish Fork, and the Dugway Proving Grounds. It will be flown in early spring of 09, with "leaf off" and natural color.

A steering committee will review the "request for bids". These bids were to be in by the end of November 5, 2008. Pricing will be based on cost per square mile. This will allow partners to know what it might cost to add to the footprint if there are funds available. The vendor will be picked, and partners and areas will be decided by December 31, 2008. Within the "request to bid", stiff penalties were defined for late delivery. Requirements were that the product would be delivered by September 30, 2009. The GISAC meeting on December 3 will finalize this project.

4. Automated Feature Extraction Project report: Both the University of Utah and Utah State University gave presentations on their research projects on automated feature extraction. Both universities used ENVI, a stand alone software and VLS, a feature analyst module that works with ArcGIS 9.3. Both universities had similar trials on the software. They each had different areas of the State to extract structures. The University of Utah had an area of Carbon County. Utah State University extracted structures in Sevier County. ENVI seemed to extract more "noise" than VLS. The University of Utah looked at using VLS as a web based extraction tool, but that didn't work. They too, found that the ENVI picked up too much "noise" around the edge of the structures. VLS was cleaner and it was able to work on ArcGIS, were ENVI had to be used with its own software.

Both universities are going to have a second year to research this more. USGS has given an assistance award to fund these two research projects. Through these projects, we hope to develop a method for the rural counties to better find structures in the rural areas of their counties. This will help with tax assessment, E911, and wild fire response.

5. Utah's Geospatial Infrastructure Strategic Plan discussion: There was a discussion on the role of GISAC and other organizations, such as UGIC, in the execution of the Utah Strategic Plan. It was decided that a smaller group, from the members of GISAC and UGIC would work together on identifying the roles of these different organizations within the Strategic Plan. They would see how our different user groups and GISAC fits into the overall implementation of the Strategic Plan.

The next meeting will be Dec 3. Place TBA.